

[Mr. Speaker] [31st July 1952]

“ The question is that the Preamble and clauses 1 and 2 do stand part of the Bill.”

The motion was carried.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I move—
‘ That the Bill be passed into law.’ ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Payment of Salaries and Removal of Disqualifications (Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.’ ”

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

(3) THE MADRAS STAGE CARRIAGES (SURCHARGE) BILL, 1952.^a

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Sir, I beg to move—
‘ That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952
(L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee,
consisting of the following Members :—

1. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
2. „ Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
3. Sri K. Rajaratn.
4. „ A. M. Sambandam.
5. „ S. Panchaksharam.
6. „ D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
7. „ N. Rajagopal.
8. „ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
9. „ H. M. Jagannatham.
10. „ A. Balarama Reddy.
11. „ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
12. Janab K. M. Seethi.
13. Dr. K. B. Menon.
14. Sri P. Thiyya Reddi.
15. „ M. Rajeswara Rao.
16. „ T. Viswanatham.
17. „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. „ K. P. Gopalan.
19. „ M. Venugopala Gvunder.
20. „ P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
21. „ P. Ratnaswami Pillai.
22. „ S. T. Adityan.
23. „ S. Ramalingam.
24. „ D. Dasarathan.
25. „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 30th June 1952.

31st July 1952]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

“ Sir, in moving this motion, I wish to bring to the notice of 11-10
 hon. Members that the Bill intends to enable the levy of a sur- a.m.
 charge on fares paid by the bus passengers. Sir, item No. 56 of
 the State List relates to ‘ Taxes on passengers carried by road ’.
 So, it is a tax exclusively within the jurisdiction of this House. As
 far as mechanically-propelled vehicles as such are concerned, they
 come under item 35 of the Concurrent List. So, if it is a case
 where tax has to be levied on the vehicles as such, it will come
 under the Concurrent List and the concurrence of the Central
 Government will have to be obtained; but as far as this Bill is
 concerned, it deals only with a tax on passengers carried on the
 road, and it is exclusively a State subject. There is thus no need
 for consultation with or the concurrence of the Central Government
 in this case.

“ Sir, it has been stated that this Bill is an attempt to tax the
 poor people who are using these buses. I should like to examine
 this statement. So far as mechanically-propelled vehicles are
 concerned, there is the railway and there are motor cars. Under
 the head ‘ motor cars ’ you have the stage carriages and the ordi-
 nary motor cars owned by private individuals. As regards private
 cars, there are about 20,000 of them now in our State and 20,000
 families are thus using their own private cars. The other members
 of the public have to use some other form of motor transport. And
 except where people go in a friend’s car, the majority of the people
 use only the stage carriages wherever they have to use a mechani-
 cally-propelled vehicle, and wherever the railway train is not
 available to them.

“ As regards the statement that it is only the poor people who
 use the buses, I must respectfully submit that it is not the poor
 people alone but all people except those who have cars of their own,
 who number about 20,000, use the buses. I am quite certain
 that even rich people use the buses especially in the rural parts.
 If we only analyse the categories of people who use the stage
 carriages, we find that the merchant classes who are moving about
 from one place to another mostly use these buses. As regards
 their capacity to pay, I respectfully submit that, comparatively
 speaking, they have got a greater capacity to pay taxes than others.
 As I said, the merchant classes are the main users of these buses
 in the rural areas and also in the urban areas. Another class of
 persons who take to these buses is the litigant public who go to
 courts very often from the rural parts. I submit again that they
 also can afford to pay a little by way of surcharge. As regards
 other sections of the people, I may say that the producer who wants
 to go to a near-by shandy for the purpose of disposing of his
 article, does not use the bus; he uses the country-cart. Therefore,
 this surcharge is not likely to touch him at all. There is yet
 another class of people which is on the increase, viz., the people
 who go to the towns from the rural parts for the purpose of seeing
 cinemas and for other entertainments. I am sure that class also
 won’t grudge paying a little more. Again, if you take the agri-
 cultural labourer or other labourer in the rural parts, you will find

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[31st July 1952]

that the occasion for him to go in the bus is very rare; perhaps an occasion will arise once a year or twice a year. Ordinarily, these labourers have no occasion to travel in a bus. If they have to go a short distance, they have still got the habit of walking it up, and it gives them good health also; even if it is four or five miles, they do not mind walking. It is a good habit. Therefore, I submit that it is a fact that the poor labourers and the poorest class of people are not at all using the buses; and even if they use, it is only occasionally once or twice a year that they do so. I myself come from a village and I am acquainted with village life. Even now, I go and live in the village, and I can therefore claim to know the villagers and their modes of life. I can therefore say with certain authority that it is only the richer classes in the villages who take to the buses, and the other classes of people either travel by bullock-cart or take to walking. In these circumstances, to say that when we levy a surcharge on the stage carriages, we will be hitting the poor most, is, I respectfully submit, not absolutely correct. We have taken this item of revenue as one to which, not the people of the lowest strata of society, economically, but the richer people, will be contributing, i.e., such people as can afford to bear the burden of the tax.

“One other point we have to take into consideration is whether the entire burden will be passed on to the passengers. My respectful submission is that it will not be passed on to them, for this reason: that even now although the maximum rate is 7 pies per mile, it is not levied because the operators feel that if they levy 7 pies, the passengers will take to other forms of transport. That is why, in my humble opinion, the rate has been restricted to 5 pies in some cases, while in the majority of cases it is restricted to six pies. And so, even if the maximum is increased to eight pies, I am sure the bus-owners will not increase the existing rates.

“On the other hand they would prefer to carry greater number of passengers and pay this surcharge from out of their own earnings. It will be possible for the bus-owners to pay a certain amount of their earnings towards this tax. My respectful submission is that the entire burden of this taxation will not be passed on to the passengers. Under these circumstances, this measure cannot be said to be a measure which would affect poor people.

“Some hon. Members asked why we chose this form of taxation and suggested that we could increase the overall taxation of Rs. 30 per seat per quarter to Rs. 40 or Rs. 50. If we adopt the suggestion, we will be taxing not only buses running on profitable or economic routes but also buses running on very uneconomic routes. A uniform rise in tax will greatly affect the buses on uneconomic routes, especially the small fleet owners, persons owning three or four buses. Therefore the present proposal is an equitable proposal. The surcharge will be in proportion to the number of passengers and mileage and therefore the earnings of the buses. There is a very wide margin in the daily collections of various buses on the different routes. It varies from Rs. 70 to

31st July 1952]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

Rs. 225, depending on the availability of traffic and the mileage done by the vehicle. When there is such a wide margin in the daily earnings of buses, in my humble opinion a uniform increase of tax on all vehicles will not be equitable. It was for this reason that the taxation was proposed in the form of surcharge.

“ There is a popular notion that the auctioning of bus routes and giving the right of plying buses to the highest bidder will fetch more revenue. I wish to point out the difficulty involved in this. It is not as if the running of buses can be started without any capital whatsoever. Each bus costs nearly Rs. 23,000 to Rs. 25,000. A man who wants to run a bus has to invest Rs. 25,000 on the vehicle alone. One will have to buy at least three or four vehicles to constitute an economic unit and for that he will have to spend at least a lakh of rupees. For attending to the maintenance and repair of buses, he should have a workshop or get himself attached to a workshop. Suppose we auction the route for one year. If a person who takes the route for one year is thrown out at the end of that period, he will be almost ruined. Suppose the period of auction is two or three years. A bus will not have run its full life within three years. It can be run even after that period. A bus operator will be at a great disadvantage of being overbidden at the subsequent auction, and all his buses and workshop will become useless. The small operators will not be able to compete in the bid. All the big operators will combine, as was the case in respect of toddy shop before the advent of prohibition, bid for a small amount, have the monopoly and earn all the profits. When the suggestion was made, it looked as if it was very good. But when we examined its implications, we found that it was not a sound proposition and therefore had to give it up. The only alternative, without encroaching on the field of the Central Government, which would not hit the poor strata of people is the form of taxation proposed in this Bill.

11-20
a.m.

“ I know there are difficulties in the working of this Act. How are we to get the returns from each operator and how are we to fix the amount of surcharge payable in respect of each bus? That will be the main headache. We have taken the necessary powers. This may be examined in the Select Committee. In lieu of this surcharge, if we levy a tax per seat per mile per annum, we may get about the same amount, viz., Rs. 1,25,00,000. The calculation will be easier in that case. Some buses run 80 to 90 miles per day, and some buses run 150 miles. The tax will be in proportion to the mileage done by the bus. All these can be discussed in the Select Committee.

“ Hon. Members may point out other difficulties in the Select Committee. It will be the endeavour of the Government to remove all the difficulties. When the Bill comes up before this House as modified by the Select Committee, I am sure all the difficulties will be removed and will be in a form which will be acceptable to the whole House. With that intention, I have moved the motion to refer the Bill to a Select Committee.”

[31st July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" Before we proceed further, I wish to point out to the Hon. Leader of the House a minor point of procedure. Under Rule 81 of the Assembly Rules, no Select Committee on a Bill shall, without the leave of the House, consist of more than fifteen members and no Select Committee shall, in any case, consist of more than 25 members. He must move a motion for obtaining the leave of the House since the Select Committee will have more than 15 members."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" The Leader of the Opposition gave me to understand that the maximum limit was 25. I am sorry I did not verify it from the rule. I move—

That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules, the leave of the House be granted to have 25 members on the Select Committee on the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952.' "

The motion was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" I will ask Mr. C. V. K. Rao to move his amendment. Then the motion as well as the amendment will be before the House."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I am not moving my amendment. I would like to explain the reason for this."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Certainly I will give him an opportunity. Motion moved—

That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

1. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
2. „ Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. „ A. M. Sambandam.
5. „ S. Panchaksharam.
6. „ D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
7. „ N. Rajagopal.
8. „ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
9. „ H. M. Jagannatham.
10. „ A. Balarama Reddy.
11. „ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
12. Janab K. M. Seethi.
13. Dr. K. B. Menon.
14. Sri P. Thimma Reddi.
15. „ M. Rajeswara Rao.
16. „ T. Viswanatham.
17. „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. „ K. P. Gopalan.

31st July 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

- 19 Sri M. Venugopala Gounder.*
20. „ P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
21. „ P. Ratnaswami Pillai.
22. „ S. T. Adityan.
23. „ S. Ramalingam.
24. „ D. Dasarathan.
25. „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.* ”

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister said that in levying this surcharge, he would not be taxing the poor and that he would be taxing only the rich people, litigants and cinema-going public. He also said that the money would not be coming from the bus travellers and that the bus operator would pay it. These two are contradictory statements. This is how the Government are trying to hoodwink the Members of this House to get more revenue somehow or other. According to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, this Bill has been brought forward in order to provide for an increase in the revenues of the State. I wish that the reasons now put forward by the Hon. Minister were incorporated in that statement. I beg to submit that this Bill is intended to tax the poor man, to rob him of his hard-earned pias.

“ If the object of this Bill is to tax the bus passengers whoever they may be, why are the Government not going to tax the bus passengers in Madras City? If the object of this Bill is to get money from bus operators, why are they not taxing the Madras bus operators namely the State? The Government know full well that there will be a large volume of opposition in the City and that is why they do not want to tax the bus passengers of the City. What holds good for the Madras City, I submit, holds good for other places as well. If the bus operators in the Madras City, namely, the Government of Madras are not prepared to pay, it stands to reason that the bus operators in the mufassal also should not be made to pay.

“ It is not the rich man who will be paying the tax while travelling in the bus. But the vast majority of the common men use this cheap means of transport, and they will have to pay the tax. Therefore, this is an unjust measure. Sir, some time back the Hon. the Chief Minister said, while speaking on Prohibition, that he did not want to rob the poor man by taxing his drink. He wanted to eliminate that tax altogether. But here is a very clear case of the Government's saying one thing and doing another. It is for political ends they bring forward Bills like this. They bring in any kind of argument to convince the public that this Bill is most harmless, and that it after all taxes only the bus operators and the rich people. They say that it does not tax the common man. I submit that this is cheating the public, if the word ‘cheating’ is parliamentary.

11-30
a.m.

“ I would like to explain how much money the poor man has got to pay. Bus is the only cheap means of transport for him.

[Sri C. V. K. Rao]

[31st July 1952]

If he has to travel 25 miles, he has got to pay at the moment ten annas. Under the provisions of this Bill, he will have to pay four annas more."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Only two annas more."

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Sir, this is not the way in which the Government should rob the poor man of his hard earned money. The Hon. Minister said that the poor man was not going to undertake long distance journeys, and that he travelled only short distances on foot. Therefore, he said the poor man would not pay any tax at all. The Hon. Minister said that rich men travelled long distances, and they had no cars. They will purchase cars only when they become Ministers. However, there are very rich landlords who use cars. They have taxis and other means of transport. To say that all people who travel in buses are rich is a contradiction in terms. This Bill is quite unwarranted and is unjust. This should be opposed. If the Government want more money, they should nationalize the large fleet of buses now owned by the bus operators. The Madras Government have made a profit from the nationalization of bus transport in the City. It is also stated that out of every 100 buses and lorries with permits, 25 buses and lorries are not paying any tax at all. The Government are not prepared to get the revenue that is due to them. They are giving a free hand to these rich people who purchase these buses and get the permits. The rich people illegally carry on their trade. If the Government are really sincere about getting money, they must get it from other sources and not tax the poor men. Therefore, Sir, I oppose the Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have to announce to the House that we will have afternoon session to-day. We will meet at 2-30 and go on till 5 o'clock or till we complete the agenda, whichever is earlier."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, after hearing the speech of the Hon. the Finance Minister while introducing the Bill, one would have got the impression that when we agreed to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, we meant that we had the liberty to change a clause here and another clause there in regard to the manner of collecting the tax, etc., and that we had agreed to the basic principle underlying the levy of this tax. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I am sure, in his speech will make the position clear as to what exactly is the stand taken by the Opposition in this matter. Leaving apart the question that we are opposed to the basic principle underlying this taxation, I would like now to answer some of the points that have been raised and the assumptions made by the Hon. the Leader of the House, while he introduced this Bill. First of all, let us see what is the basic principle of taxation underlying this Bill. I would like to know from the Hon. the Finance Minister whether he understands elementary economics. I would like to ask him to realize what exactly is the economic situation in our country to-day. There is

31st July 1952]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

a slump in the country and the purchasing power of the vast majority of the people is tremendously falling. There is a terrific slump. It is a very vicious circle, one aggravating the another. There is no way out. What does our Finance Minister propose to do to solve the slump and tackle the problems created by the slump? The only solution the Finance Minister can offer is to mop up the purchasing power of the people further so that the intensity of the slump may increase hundredfold. I would like to inform the Government that this will act as a boomerang on the Government themselves, and that this would lead to a further intensification of the economic crisis leading ultimately to a crash of our entire economy and to the bankruptcy of the State itself. Secondly, what is the basis of this tax? It was very cleverly stated that after all it was just an increase of one pie per mile. The total amount of revenue to be realized from this tax is about Rs. 2 crores per year. One of the Hon. Ministers speaking across the table told me that it was after all a question of taxing the people at the rate of 8 annas per head in the whole course of one year. I am here reminded of a certain story about Chettiyars. It is only a story, and I am not making any reflection upon any Member of this House or on the Hon. Member the Raja of Chettinad. The story is that the Chettiyars are, after all, taking interest only at the rate of one pie for every pie. Just like that story, it is stated here that after all it is only 8 annas that is being levied on an individual for a whole year. That is not the question. The question is what is the amount of taxation that the people of this country are already bearing, and whether any further increase in the tax burden they will be able to bear, or whether this tax will prove to be the last straw on the camel's back. I would like to point out that in this country the average taxation per head of the population works out to roughly Rs. 25. This includes the taxes that are levied by the Central Government also. The provincial taxes per head of the population work out to Rs. 12½ per year. Rs. 61 crores for a population of 4½ crores works out to roughly Rs. 12½ per head of the population. Leaving alone the educational cess and other cesses that are levied by the district boards and municipalities, the total taxes levied by the Central Government and the State Government work out roughly to Rs. 25 per head of the population.

"It may be said that Rs. 25 per head is, after all, not a big amount. But we have to take into account the average income of the people of this country. The *per capita* income of the people of this country, according to a survey conducted by a committee appointed by the Government of India recently and presided over by an eminent statistician, is hardly Rs. 65 per annum. This is perhaps the lowest figure of income in any part of the world. The people of this country are so very poor. They are already paying tax of Rs. 25 on this income. I would say that that is the highest incidence of taxation on the people, if we take into account the poverty of the country and the extreme misery that the people are already suffering from. Therefore, it is that I say

11-40
a.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[31st July 1952]

that the introduction of a levy of 8 annas per individual is going to prove to be the last straw that breaks the camel's back and people are going to fight against it.

“ Secondly, the Hon. the Finance Minister was expatiating on what classes of the people are going to be affected by this levy. I was just feeling whether the Hon. Minister was going to say, ‘ There can be any amount of increase in the food prices. Rice can to-day sell not at Re. 1 or Re. 1-4-0 per measure but at Rs. 2 per measure because it is not the poor people alone that use rice. The rich men are also using rice and all sorts of people are using it. Therefore, why should there be any apprehension that the burden is going to fall only on the poor people? ’ Sir, the question should not be looked at that way. It has got to be looked at from the point of view of the main incidence of taxation. It may be that certain big merchants or certain rich classes of people sometimes in their lives—for example, when their car goes out of order—use the bus transport. But regarding the question on what classes of people the incidence of taxation is going to fall mainly, I submit that the reasonings of the Hon. the Finance Minister cannot hold water. In this regard, the bus operators themselves are the best certifiers and not the Hon. the Finance Minister who goes to his village once in two or three years, perhaps for a holiday, because he has always been practising in Coimbatore. Therefore, he is not the person competent to give a certificate as to who are the people that use the bus transport very often. I submit the bus operators themselves know who are actually travelling by buses in the entire State. They have already stated that it is the common people that frequently travel by buses. When they talk of common people, they refer to poor people. After all, the overwhelming majority of the people of this country are poor people. The number of people who are rich can be counted on one's fingers. To-day the overwhelming majority of the people already being very poor, it is not fair to make an invidious distinction and say that only very poor sections of the people do not use the bus transport. The contention that the majority of the people who use the bus transport belong to the richer classes cannot hold water. It is an argument that has got to be refuted. Can the Hon. Minister deny that the majority of the middle class people have got to use the bus transport at some time or other? There are middle class people who are mostly users of the bus transport. Now, if we assume for the moment that certain sections of the lowest class of people do not use the bus transport, then it means that the incidence of taxation on the middle class people is not going to be at the rate of 8 annas per head but it is going to be much more than that. It means that the middle class people in our State will have to spend not less than about Rs. 40 per head by way of increased taxation. This is the way in which the Government expect to get money from the common people of this country. Sir, in 1926 or 1927 when Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel was leading the Bardoli Satyagraha Movement, he said that air alone was left untaxed by the British Government in this country. To-day I would like to ask the Government,

31st July 1952]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

'Are you not following in the footsteps of the same British Government?' What is it that the Government are leaving untaxed now? They are levying a tax on every service that the common people of this country have got to resort to. They are greedy. The Hon. the Chief Minister always talks of greed while referring to the Opposition. I must submit that the most greedy element existing in this country is the Government of Madras. (Applause from the Opposition Benches.) There is nothing but greed exhibited in this Bill. Therefore, I say that the entire principle underlying this taxation Bill is repugnant to all accepted principles of public finance and taxation, and it must go lock, stock and barrel."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am one of those who do not like the Bill. But as it is going to be referred to a Select Committee, it can be thoroughly discussed there. I must, however, say what I feel about the aims and objects expounded by the Hon. Minister. Sir, I think many hon. Members here will agree with me that if each Member could be given three or four bus routes, we would not want the monthly salary or daily allowance now paid to us. If we are given three or four bus routes, we will pay to the Government everything incidental to it, namely, licence fee and other things just as other bus-owners will pay. We will be happy then because we will be profiting not only ourselves but also others. I do not have the necessary capital to invest but I will have somebody else to invest the required capital. He will profit himself and also will be profiting me to the extent of three or four times my salary and allowances. When that is the position, there is no point in saying that the proprietors of buses or the bus route owners will be affected by this taxation. One of the progressive Members was saying this morning that the proprietors would be affected by this taxation. Not at all, Sir. I would like such hon. Members to note that they should not speak on the authority of news from books published but on the authority of news got from the people who are running the buses. Proprietors of buses will not at all be affected by this taxation. It is the passengers that will really be affected. In the existing rules relating to the running of buses there is a provision that if passengers travel for four miles or less, they will have to pay a minimum of four annas. I know that old people who cannot walk, when they get into buses, are forced to pay that four annas. In many a place and in many buses I have seen that."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—"I would like to inform the hon. Member that nobody from this side of the House stated, while speaking on this Bill, that the proprietors would be affected. It is the Hon. the Finance Minister himself that stated it, as far as this Bill is concerned."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—"I do not know if the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi was present when a progressive Member of this House belonging to the Socialist Party was speaking on this Bill. If the hon. Member Sri Ramamurthi feels that his Party alone is progressive, then I have nothing to say in the matter."

[31st July 1952]

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—“ I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to. If he is referring to the question of the increase in the tax on petrol, I would like to repeat what I said, for his benefit, because it seems to have been misunderstood. I said, as a matter of general principle, we would like the incidence of taxation to fall on the rich. The people who use motor cars are normally rich and, therefore, I said that we would normally have no objection to an increase in the tax on petrol. In this particular case, I went on to say, there are grounds to believe that this tax is likely to be regressive. That is all I said. If the hon. Member misunderstood me, I am very sorry.”

* SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—“ I have understood the hon. Member very well. As the Hon. Sri Rajagopalachari said, not 6 annas or 8 annas but even 12 annas these proprietors could pay. If the tax that is now proposed will not fall on the poor people but will fall on the proprietors alone, I will say that even double or thrice the amount of the tax may be levied. Many of my relatives are bus proprietors and I know this business is profitable. So, it is the passengers that will be affected by this tax. The bus proprietors are already collecting from the passengers 8 pies and even 12 pies. We have been travellers and we know it. If this increase in tax is effected, they will collect from the passengers still more.

11-50
a.m.

“ There is the extra income from overloading buses in every route. Every bus-owner is making extra money every day and on every route. Only once in six months or one year, some of them are charged for overload. Many of them are left. These officers who are engaged on the work of detecting such overloads are only charging the ordinary, poor bus proprietors and are letting off the richer proprietors. Whatever it is, these proprietors are getting a lot of money and that is the point which I wish to stress in this connection. So, let us not be thinking that the bus-proprietors will be hard hit if they are taxed. It is the poor travelling public that will be hit.

“ The policy advocated by our Party for a long number of years in the past is that these routes must be auctioned. I do not know why the Government have not yet thought it fit to do this. The Hon. Minister who moved this Bill said that it is not possible to auction these things. If this is not possible, where will be the possibility to do anything? At present shandy and markets are being auctioned in certain municipal and district board areas. Why don't you expect that the richer people in those places will join together and crush the ordinary poor men? The Government, I know, have never thought like that and have permitted such things to go on. Then, what about these fish ponds and other things? The Government have been auctioning those things and they never thought that it was bad. My opinion is that in auctioning, there will be facility even for the ordinary man to compete with the richer man. I know what these shandy contractors do. Of course some rich people take part in the auction along with the ordinary people. I may tell this House, these rich people can only purchase the poor contractor and

31st July 1952]

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

not bid with him. I know what is taking place there. These rich men bid for a low amount and rebid it and share the general profit or they pay something to the other bidders and bid for a small amount and get the whole thing themselves. What is the harm in auctioning these bus routes? Is a bus-owner considered a poor man? The Hon. Minister himself has said that a bus will cost Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 25,000. In this poor country, can a man who possesses Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 25,000 be classified as a poor man? Even a man who has four to five thousand rupees is considered a rich man in his own sphere. When that is the case, these people can never be called rich. That is why I say that these big men, these big capitalists and these rich men should not be allowed to go on monopolising these routes. Others must also be given opportunities. The ordinary poor men also must have a chance in this matter. These routes must be auctioned so that everybody can have a say in the matter.

“Where is the need for a workshop for these people? There are many bus-owners, who are themselves drivers, conductors and workmen. They repair their own buses. They never go to workshops and pay heavy sums for getting their buses repaired. Even those who own one or two buses never go to workshops and they themselves repair their buses. In this manner, they do not incur much expenditure on maintaining their buses and thus they get enormous profit. I know of many cases where people have earned a lot through buses. In Rayalaseema, I know of two persons, who were bus drivers 20 years back. To-day, they have Rs. 30 to Rs. 40 lakhs each. There are many others who have become millionaires in this manner. I am mentioning all these things only to show that this bus business is not a mere profession, wherein one can find his simple living. It is not so. If only the Government can properly assess the profits earned by these bus proprietors in different routes, and if only they are able to tax them properly, the Government will be able to get a great amount. Let us not ruin these bus-owners and let us not make them insolvents. That is not my point. They are getting huge profits. Out of those profits, if the Government are able to extract the maximum money by way of taxes, then there will be no need for any other new taxation and there will be no need for any Select Committee to go into this Bill. There will be no need for any loan and there will be no need for getting any grant from the Central Government. By adopting the method suggested by me, the Government will be able to get Rs. 7 to Rs. 8 crores.

“In this connexion, I wish to make a reference to the removal of non-official elements from some of the transport authorities. Who is the Collector, who is the Superintendent and who are the various officers? Are they not our relatives, are they not our friends? I know many of them are the toys and pawns of influential politicians and other non-officials. When that is the case, how can the people expect complete ‘High Court Justice’ in the matter of these bus routes? I have been carefully watching how these bus routes are granted. I know there are certain interests, certain

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi] [31st July 1952]

very influential interests that are working in the matter of these bus routes. I know certain cases, where these routes have been allotted, but later on cancelled by Ministers. If anybody has any doubt in this matter, let him refer to the records of the Central Road Traffic Board. Then he will see how in the last five years, bus routes have been given to various people. It has become a scandalous history in the last five years. It has brought infamy for the Government. People began to term the Madras Government as a 'bus-route Government'. Many of us know this and how scandalous it has been. Are not some of the Members who are sitting here now and who were in the previous House also in the past, aware that there have been many discussions on this subject in the past? Have not reports about it appeared in newspapers? I know the whole history, the people in the district know the whole history. I have myself written to the authorities. Even now, more routes are not given. In the present House, I have put some questions relating to some incidents in this connexion and I got the reply that it was a fact that such and such thing took place in the past. I also wish to take this opportunity to mention that the many representations and protests submitted to the authorities in the past are missing in the Road Traffic Board office. What has happened to those things? Wherever more routes ought to have been opened, they have not been opened. The result was that only a few people monopolised all the bus routes."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" With great respect to the hon. Member, I am afraid he is going off the mark and off the track also. We are now discussing the levy of a surcharge on bus fares. We are not now concerned with the Road Traffic Board and other things. We had sufficient opportunity to refer to these things during the budget discussion. I, therefore, respectfully request the hon. Member to confine his remarks within the scope of the Bill."

SRI P. THIMMA REDDI :—" Sir, I had to mention these things to the hon. Members of this House and to the Hon. Minister only to show that there was absolutely no necessity for levying this surcharge on the poor travelling public. I only suggest that even under the existing system, by an alternative arrangement, we can get greater income from the bus-owners for the State, and we need not think of levying a surcharge of one pie or increasing the fares to eight pies per mile.* The bus proprietors will pay the tax. If anybody were to say that it cannot be done, then I disagree with them. My only plea is that we should not tax the poor passengers. That is why I say that we must discuss the whole thing thoroughly, and if we can reach an agreement with the bus proprietors, then it is well and good. I wish to emphasize that whatever we may do must not hit the poor travelling public. Bearing this point clearly in view, we must proceed with the consideration of this Bill. Sir, I only took this occasion* to enlighten the hon. Members here as to how these bus routes are granted, as to how these bus-owners are reaping enormous profits, and as to

31st July 1952]

[Sri P. Thimma Reddi]

how the State can get easily Rs. 7 to Rs. 8 crores by accepting my suggestion with regard to auctioning the routes and other matters. With these suggestions, I conclude my speech, Sir."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not feel that it is very necessary to make a long speech when the Bill is to be referred to a Select Committee. I rise to put a question or two to the Hon. the Minister for Finance for information, but before I do that, I would like to make a few remarks. 12 noon.

" The Hon. the Minister for Finance made a very ingenious effort to prove that the surcharge on bus fares will be paid by the rich. We have to be very careful when we use the word 'rich' in a country where purchases are made on the split pie. If the Minister would go and sit in a village grocery shop, he would see how purchases are made by the lower middle class on the split pie. I would remind hon. Members that there are only a few in the whole of India who pay income-tax. According to the United Nations' reports, not more than 700,000 people pay it in the whole of India, and if we come to South India, the number will be considerably less. The average income of an Indian is sixty-five rupees and if we come to South India, the average income is much less than this. When it comes to my district of Malabar, it is only half the income of Andhra or Tamilnad. When we remember all these facts, it is very difficult to accept that the tax now proposed—surcharge on the bus fares—is borne by the rich. When the Hon. the Minister made the statement that the poor man often prefers to walk or pick up a ride in a shaky, rickety bullock-cart, has he asked himself the question whether he does it out of free choice or whether he is compelled to do it by circumstances? I wonder whether he walks for his health or picks up the ride in the rickety cart because he likes to have a joy ride.

" I would like to make one other remark on the statement made by the Hon. the Minister for Finance that the bus-owners were willing to pay the surcharge. I have a very shrewd suspicion that the bus-owners have their own reasons for making this statement. I know how the buses are run. I know how accounts are kept. I know how little check there is by the Government on the collections that are made by the bus-owners. I have a very shrewd suspicion, as I said, why they are willing to pay this surcharge. They do not want any scrutiny of or check upon the income they get from the buses. They shed crocodile tears at the Bus-owners' Conference for the poor man. They complimented him; they offered him their goodwill. Why, they know their accounts are not scrutinized and so can increase their income by sympathizing with the poor man who uses the buses.

" With these remarks, I would request the Minister to tell me what the terms of reference for this Committee will be, whether the Committee will be qualified to make alternative proposals for taxation and whether the Committee will be permitted to discuss policies with regard to bus services."

(At this stage Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.)

[31st July 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I would like hon. Members to be very brief since the Bill will come before the Assembly again after it is reported upon by the Select Committee.”

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, there are one or two points I wish to make. The Hon. the Minister for Finance was telling us that the fares, as they are, are rather low. Perhaps the present position is not known to him. As a matter of fact, I know the position well. If one wants to go from Madras to Nellore, one pays the fare for that distance. But there are a number of stations in between, Gudur, Naidupet, Sulurpet and so on. If one takes a ticket for Nellore only, one will be taken into the bus. So much so, if a man wants to go to Gudur, he has to pay the fare for Nellore. This is the case with almost all the routes. Unless we pay the fare for the terminus, we do not get a seat. Consequently, we pay not seven pies per mile but something like five annas per mile. The minimum is five annas per mile. Even if you travel one mile, you will have to pay five annas and still there is a terrible row for getting a seat. While the Minister says, it is seven pies per mile, in actual practice five annas is collected, not collected, but passengers are fleeced to pay. I know, as a matter of fact, many of the bus-owners are monopolists and they are virtually the kings of the place. They select passengers whom they should take and leave the rest behind.

“ Then, Sir, the Minister has said that keeping of accounts is not practicable when the bus-owner has to deal with a number of passengers, and that the Government will be satisfied with a certain amount which may be fixed on some agreement which they may enter into with bus-owners. Sir, this will give rise to a lot of underhand dealings, because the man who has got the biggest pull with the Government will be paying the smallest surcharge. His hands will be naturally free to charge whatever amount he likes per mile, per passenger. Let the Minister remember that it is not seven pies but five annas that is charged to-day. If he really wants to administer this measure correctly, let him ask the bus-owners or make them pay something fixed. Let not anarchy be here. I also know that in some districts, no new bus operators are allowed to come into the field. The old operator's uncle, or brother or some such relative is given new routes to operate. As a matter of fact, in Nellore it is only one man's show. A single man has got eighty per cent of the routes though the permits are not in his name, but in the name of his relatives. Therefore, I say, we are dealing with a very powerful monopoly and we have to be very careful to see that the burden of taxation is not shifted on to the poor.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill because the Government want money to spend on certain items we do not approve of. It is not enough if the objective alone is fair. The means should also be fair. But here both the means and the objective are not fair. There is no guarantee that the people of this State will be given food. There is no guarantee that the people will be given cheap clothing. There is no guarantee

31st July 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

that the people will be given a democratic form of Government. Sir, the argument came that the proprietors of bus companies will have to bear the burden. I do not agree because in the year 1949, as far as my information goes, there was a proposal to have a surcharge on each ticket sold and after some discussion and also agitation, it was dropped. Then, the tax on seat was Rs. 17 and it was raised to Rs. 30, that is by about 78 per cent. But what happened later? This was actually collected from the passengers. Half a pie was added to the ticket fare per mile per passenger, but the bus-owners were collecting more. Let us come to the present measure. This will require the passengers to pay an enhanced fare in terms of a coin which is not really in circulation now. What I fear is, the conductors will be forced either to collect more or to collect less. In that situation, I am sure very many people will be prosecuted by the Sub-Inspectors of Police and lot of trouble will arise. There will be a deadlock facing this transport industry. After all, there is scarcity of transport services in our State and my humble submission to the Government is that this taxation proposal which will affect the poor people should be dropped. Hence, I oppose the Bill here and I am going to oppose it in the Select Committee also."

* SRI A. GOVINDASWAMI NAYAGAR :—“ கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள், “இப்பொழுது போட உத்தேசித்திருக்கின்ற பல சர்சார்ஜ் வரியானது பஸ்விலி பிரயாணம் செய்கிற ஏழை மக்களை பாதிக்கவில்லை என்றும், பணக்காரர்களைத்தான் பாதிக்கும் என்றும் கூறுகிறார். ஆகையால் இதை ஒப்புக்கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்பதாகக் கேட்டுக்கொண்டார். கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் ஏழை மக்களுடன் தொடர்பு கொண்டவர்களா? அவர் ஒரு பெரிய செல்வந்தர் குடும்பத்தில் பிறந்தவர். ஒரு நாள் கூட அவர் பஸ்விலி பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்க மாட்டார். அப்படி என்றாவது பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறார்களா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன்? ”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ பல நாட்கள் நான் பஸ்விலி பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறேன். ”

* SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR :—“ பல நாட்கள் பஸ்விலி பிரயாணம் செய்திருக்கிறேன் என்று நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார். அவருடைய கார் ரிப்பேராயிருந்த காலங்களில் அவர் அவ்விதம் பிரயாணம் செய்திருப்பார்கள் என்று நினைக்கிறேன். (சிரிப்பு)

“ நிச்சயமாகச் சொல்லுவேன். இந்த பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரியானது ஏழை யைத்தான் பாதிக்கிறது முன்பு விற்பனை வரியைப் போட்டபொழுது அது ஏழையைத்தான் பாதிக்கும் என்று சொல்லப்பட்டது. ஆனால் அது ஏழையை ஒன்றும் பாதிக்காது. வியாபாரிகள் விற்பனை வரியை சர்க்காருக்குக் கட்டப்போகிறார்கள் ”, என்று பதிலளித்து விட்டார்கள். அதே போல வியாபாரிகள் இதற்கு பலமான எதிர்ப்பைத் தெரிவித்தபொழுது, “ நீங்கள் ஏன் எதிர்க்கிறீர்கள் நீங்கள் சாமானை விற்பும்பொழுது சாமானை வாங்குபவரிடமிருந்து வரியை வாங்கிக்கொடுக்கப் போகிறீர்கள் ”, என்று சொல்லிவிட்டார்கள். ஆக ஒரு பைசா என்று வரியைப் போட்டுத்தான் இன்று சர்க்கார் காமதேனு என்று சொல்லக் கூடிய அளவில் கோடிக்கணக்கான ரூபாய்களை வசூலித்து விடுகிறார்கள். கனம் ஸ்ரீ லி. ராஜகோபால்ஸ் ஹியார் சர்க்கார் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும் மைனுக்கு ஒரு பைசா பஸ் சர்சார்ஜ் வரிப் பிரேரணையை முழு மூச்சாக எதிர்க்கிறேன். ஒவ்வொருவரும் கனம் ஆச்சாரியார் சொல்கிறதான் அந்தராத்யாவக் தொட்டுப்பார்த்துக் கொண்டு இந்த வரிப் பிரேரணையால் மக்களுக்குக் கெடுதி உண்டா இல்லையா என்பதை யோசித்தால் நிச்சயமாக எல்லோரும் இதை எதிர்ப்பார்கள்

[Sri A. Govindasamy Nayagar]

[31st July 1952]

என்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன். நீங்கள் இந்த பஸ்சர்சார்ஜ் வரியைப் போட்டு விட்டு உங்கள் தொகுதிக்குத் திரும்பச் செல்லீர்களேயானால் உங்களை ஜனங்கள் எவ்வளவு கேவலமாகப் பேசுவார்கள் என்பதைக் கொஞ்சம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். நாங்கள் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் பங்கெடுத்துக்கொள்ள ஒத்துக்கொண்டோமென்றால் இந்த மசோதாவை ஆதரித்து அல்ல. இதை பூரணமாக வெளியே வரமுடியாதபடி செய்பவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடேபோதான் நாங்கள் ஒப்புக்கொண்டோம் என்பதை இந்தச் சபையில் சொல்லுகிறேன். இன்று பஸ்களில் ஏழைகளும் நடுத்தர மக்களும் தான் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள். மாணவர்களும் தான் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள், தொழிலாளர்கள் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள். சர்க்காரில் குறைந்த சம்பளம் வாங்குகிற உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களும்தான் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள். இப்படி இருக்கும்பொழுது இவர்கள் எல்லோரையுமே பாதிக்கக் கூடியவகையில் பஸ் வரித் திட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்துவிட்டு இதனால் ஏழைகள் யாரும் பாதிக்கப்படமாட்டார்கள் என்று சொல்வது சரியாகாது. தொழிலாளர்கள் இன்று தங்கள் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்திற்கு ஏற்றபடி ஊதியம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டால்தான் ராஜாஜியைப் போன்ற மேதை வீணாகப் பணத்தை செலவழிக்காதீர்கள் சிக்கனமாக இருக்கக் கற்றுக் கொள்ளுங்கள். சினிமாவுக்குப் போகாதீர்கள். சினிமாவுக்குச் செலவழிக்கிற பணத்தை என்னிடம் கொடுங்கள்,” என்று சொல்லுகிறார். அதே சமயத்தில் கனம் ராஜாஜியின் மந்திரி சபையிலேயே இருக்கின்ற கனம் மந்திரி ஸ்ரீ பட்டாபிராம ராவ் சர்க்கார் சிலவில் அஞ்சலித் தாங்கிப் பரிசு வழங்குகிறார். இவர்கள் சொல்வதும், செய்வதும் ஒன்றுக்கொன்று முரணாக இல்லையா? (பலத்த சிரிப்பு) கனம் மந்திரியே இப்படி பரிசு வழங்கினால் சினிமாவில் உற்சாகத்தை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டுமென்ற நோக்கத்தோடு செய்வதாகத் தோன்றவில்லையா?

“இந்த பஸ் சார்ஜ் ஏழைகளை எப்படி, பாதிக்கிறது என்பதற்குச் சான்றாக இன்று குறிப்பாக ஒன்றைச் சொல்லுகிறேன். சென்னையிலிருந்து திண்டிவனத்திற்குப் போகவேண்டுமென்றால் ரயிலில் போனால் 2 ரூபாய்கள் கொடுக்கவேண்டும். ஒரு மைலுக்கு 8 பைசா வீதம் டஸ்ஸில் ரூபாய் 3-2-0 ஆகிறது ஒரு சாதாரண ஏழை இப்பொழுது ரூ. 1-2-0 கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்றால் இது அக்கிரமம் இல்” யா என்பதை நீங்கள் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இதற்குப் பதிலாக பஸ் ரூட்டை அதிகரித்தால் ஜனங்களுக்கும் சௌகரியமாக இருக்கும். அதோடு மூன்று மாதத்திற்கு ஒரு சீட்டிற்கு 30 ரூபாய்கள் வீதம் பங்கு வரி போடப்படுகிறது. இன்னும் அதிகமான பஸ் ரூட்டுகளை ஏற்படுத்தி அதிகமான பஸ்களை ஓடச் செய்தால் அதன் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு அதிக லாபம் வராதா என்று நான் கேட்கிறேன். பல கோடிக்கணக்கான மக்களுக்கும் சௌகரியம் செய்து கொடுக்க ஏதுவாகும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஸ்ரீ திம்மா ரெட்டி சொன்னதைப்போல் பஸ் ரூட்டுகள் கொடுக்க வேண்டியதேயில்லை. கனம் மந்திரியார்கள் பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்தால் சட்டபை மெம்பர்களைப்பற்றி பஸ் ரூட் விஷயமாக எவ்வளவு கேவலமாகப் பொதுஜனங்கள் பேசுகிறார்கள் என்ற விஷயம் தெரியும். அதனால்தான் சொல்லுகிறேன், எங்களுக்குப் பஸ் ரூட்டும் வேண்டாம். ஜனங்கள் கேவலமாக பேசுவதையும் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளும்படி செய்பவேண்டாம் என்று கேட்டுக் கொண்டு என் பிரசங்கத்தை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI K. T. KOSALRAM :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த மசோதாவை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்புவதை ஆதரிக்கின்றேன். இந்த மசோதாவானது எந்த நிலைமையில் மீண்டும் இந்தச் சபையில் சமர்ப்பிக்கப்படவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக, நண்பர் நிதி அமைச்சர் ஸ்ரீமான் சுப்ரமணியம் அவர்கள் கவனத்திற்குச் சில விஷயங்களை நான் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“நீங்கள் இப்பொழுது கொண்டுவந்திருக்கிற மசோதாவானது பஸ் பிரயாணிகளை மிகுந்த கஷ்டத்திற்குட்படுத்தவதோடு மட்டுமல்லாமல், உங்கள் சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் இந்தச் சட்டத்தை ஒழுங்காக நிர்வகிக்க முடியுமா என்பதையும் நீங்கள் சற்று யோசிக்கவேண்டும்.

31st July 1952]

[Sri K. T. Kosalram]

“இந்த மாகாணத்தில் சுமார் 7,000 பஸ்கள் இருக்கின்றன. ஒரு பஸ்ஸில் 30 லீட்கள் இருக்கின்றன. 7,000 பஸ்கள் இருக்கும்போது, ஒரு நாளைக்கு ஒரு பஸ் ஒரு டிரிப் ஓடினாலும், 2 லக்ஷம் 10 ஆயிரம் பிரயாணிகள் பஸ்ஸில் செல்கின்றார்கள். சாதாரணமாக ஒரு நாளைக்கு ஒரு பஸ் 5 டிரிப்புகள் ஓடுகின்றன. 7 ஆயிரம் பஸ்களும் ஒரு நாளைக்கு 5 டிரிப்புகள் ஓடினால், 10 லக்ஷம் டிக்கட்டுகளுக்குமேல் கண்டக்டர்கள் issue பண்ணுகிறார்கள். இந்த 10 லக்ஷத்திற்கு அதிகமான டிக்கட்டுகளை யெல்லாம் நீங்கள் பரிசீலனை செய்து, தம்படி தம்படியாக உங்கள் அதிகாரிகளால் வசூலிக்கவேண்டுமென்றால் அது முடியுமா? டஸ் முதலானிகள்தான் அதைக் கணக்கு வைத்துக்கொள்ள முடியுமா? இதையெல்லாம் நீங்கள் சற்று சிந்தித்துப் பார்த்தீர்களா என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன். அது மிகவும் கஷ்டமான காரியமாகும்.

“இந்த மசோதாவை நீங்கள் கொண்டுவந்திருக்கும்போது, நான் இதை எதிர்க்கின்றேன் என்று சொல்லமுடியாது. வரி போடவேண்டாமென்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. ஆனால், நீங்கள் போடுகின்ற வரியானது இந்த மாகாண மக்களை எவ்விதம் பாதிக்கின்றது என்பதையும், சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகள் அந்த வரியை எவ்விதம் வசூலிக்கப் போடுகின்றார்கள் என்பதையும் பற்றித்தான் சொல்லுகின்றேன்.

“எதிர்க் கட்சியில் இருக்கின்ற ஒரு சில அங்கத்தினர்கள் ‘சொல்கிற போது, அவர்களுக்கு சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டும், இவர்களுக்கு சம்பளத்தை உயர்த்த வேண்டும், இதைச் செய்யவேண்டும், அதைச் செய்யவேண்டும்’ என்று சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கும்போதே, ‘வரியை போடவேண்டாம்’ என்று சொல்வதைப்போல், நான் சொல்லவில்லை. (Interruption by Mr. Vinayakam) உங்களை நான் சொல்லவில்லை. ‘எதிர்க்கட்சியில் இருக்கும் எல்லாரும் அம்மாதிரி சொல்லுகின்றார்கள்’ என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லை. ‘எதிர்க்கட்சியிலிருக்கும் ஒரு சில நண்பர்கள் அம்மாதிரி சொல்லுகின்றார்கள்’ என்றுதான் சொல்லுகின்றேன். எதிர்க் கட்சியிலிருக்கும் ஒரு சில நண்பர்களைக் குறித்துச் சொல்கிறேனெய்யோடீய, நான் எல்லோரையும் சொல்லவில்லை. குறிப்பாக, கம்ப்யூனிஸ்ட் மெம்பர்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். இதைச் செய்தால் அதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்கின்றார்கள். அதைச் செய்தால் இதைச் செய்யவேண்டுமென்கின்றார்கள். அவர்களுடைய கொள்கை அது. ஆகையால், அவர்களைச் சொல்லுகிறேனெய்யோடீய, நண்பர் ஸ்ரீ விநாயகம் அவர்களைச் சொல்லவில்லை. அவர் Constitutive ஆக யோசனை சொல்லுகின்றார்கள் என்பது எனக்கும் தெரியும்.

“ஆகவே, நீங்கள் வரி போடுங்கள், வேண்டாமென்று சொல்லவில்லை. ஆனால், அப்படி வரி போடும்போது பஸ் முதலாளிகளும், பொதுமக்களும், எந்த அளவு பாதிக்கப்படுகிறார்கள் என்பதை யோசித்து, நியாயமாகப் போடவேண்டும். ஒரு நாளைக்குப் பத்து லக்ஷத்திற்குமேல் டிக்கட்டுகளைப் பார்ப்பதென்பது முடியாத காரியமாகும்.

“இதற்கு வழி என்ன என்று நீங்கள் கேட்கலாம். பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி அங்கத்தினர்கள் செய்யவேண்டியதை நாங்கள் செய்யவேண்டுமென்று நீனைக் கவிலலை. இந்த மசோதாவைக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமா, வேண்டாமா என்று சொல்வதற்கு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு உரிமை இருக்கிறது. மசோதா வேண்டாமென்று இந்தச் சபையில் கொண்டு வந்து விடலாம். ஆனால், அதைப்பற்றி முடிவு கூறுவதற்கு பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு விட்டுவிடவேண்டும். அதைப்பற்றி நான் ஒன்றும் சொல்வதற்குத் தயாராயில்லை.

“நான் சொல்வது என்னவென்றால், நீங்கள் மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு ஒரு ரூபாய் வீதம் வருஷமொன்றுக்கு ரூ. 3,000, பஸ் ஒன்றுக்கு வரி போடலாம். 8 அணு வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 1,500 வருமானம் வரும். 4 அணு வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 750 வருமானம் வரும். மூன்று விதமான திட்டங்களை வைத்துக்கொண்டு வசூல் செய்யலாம். அதாவது மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு 4 அணு போட்டால் ரூ. 750-ம், மைல் ஒன்றுக்கு 8 அணு போட்டால் ரூ. 1,500-ம், ரூ. 1 வீதம் போட்டால் ரூ. 3,000 வசூலிக்கலாம். இவ்விதம்

[Sri K. T. Kosalram]

[31st July 1952]

நீங்கள் பஸ் முதலாளிகளிடம் வாங்கிவிட்டால், பஸ் முதலாளிகள் என்ன கேட்கிறார்கள் என்பதை பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டியில் அவர்கள் சொல்லிக் கொள்ளுவார்கள். அதைப்பற்றி நான் சொல்வதற்குத் தயாராயில்லை. நீங்கள் இவ்விதம் போடவேண்டுமென்றால் பஸ் முதலாளிகள் கேட்கின்ற சலுகைகளைப்பற்றி நீங்கள் நேருக்கு நோ கேட்டுக்கொள்ளலாம். லீட் ஜெனுக்கு ரூ. 1 அல்லது 8 அணு அல்லது 4 அணு வீதம் வசூலிக்கலாமா என்பதைத்தான் நீங்கள் பார்க்கவேண்டும்.

“ஒவ்வொரு பிரயாணியின் டிக்கட்டின்மீதும் வரி விதிக்கவேண்டுமென்று நினைத்தீர்களானால், கணம் உண்பர் ஸ்ரீ கோவிந்தசாமி நாயகர் சொன்னதில் தப்பே கிடையாது. ஊரில் மந்திரிகளை மக்கள் நல்ல விதமாகப் பேசமாட்டார்கள். சட்டசபை அங்கத்தினர்களாயிருந்தாலும், கல்லைத் தூக்கி விட்டெறிவார்கள் என்பதை மறந்துவிடக்கூடாது. ஆகவே, பஸ் பிரயாணிகளின்மீது டிக்கட் கணக்கை வைத்துக்கொண்டு நீங்கள் வரி போடக்கூடாது.

“யார் மீது இந்த வரி போடப்படுகின்றது என்பது எனக்குச் சரியாகப் புரியவில்லை. இதுவுள்ள மர்மம் எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. கார்ப்பரேஷன் ஏரியாவில் ஒரே பலகளுக்கு சர்க்கார் விதிவிலக்காக அளித்திருக்கிறார்கள். நகரங்களுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கவும் சர்க்கார் இந்த மசோதாவில் அதிகாரம் கொடுத்திருக்கின்றார்கள். யாராவது தனிப்பட்ட முதலாளிகள் சர்க்காரை அணுகினார்களா? அவர்கள் உங்களை influence பண்ணினார்கள் என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. ஆகவே, குறிப்பாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், சில நகரங்களில் தனிப்பட்ட கம்பெனிகள் monopolise பண்ணியிருக்கிறது. அந்த கம்பெனிகளுக்கு விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்க இந்த மசோதாவில் இடமிருக்கிறது என்று நினைக்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, எந்த நகரங்களுக்கும் விதிவிலக்கு அளிக்கும் டியாக சர்க்கார் வைத்துக் கொள்ளக்கூடாது. இருந்தால் எல்லா இடத்திற்கும் இருக்கவேண்டும். சிராமன்ஸில் உள்ளவர்கள் மட்டும் என்ன பைத்தியக்காரர்களா என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, universal ஆக இருக்கவேண்டுமே தவிர, சில இடங்களுக்கு exemption கொடுத்திருப்பது தவறு. அதைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டி நன்றாக கவனிக்கவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, இந்த மசோதாவைப் பொறுக்குக் கமிட்டிக்கு அனுப்புவதை ஆதரிக்கின்றேன்.”

12-20
p.m.

SRI S. T. ADITYAN :—“I rise to make only one point, Sir. The Hon. Minister said that as far as poor people were concerned they did not travel by bus. I am not concerned whether poor people travel by bus or not. The question is whether we are not making bus travel costly by this tax. We must make the bus travel cheap for the poor people. We must approach this problem with this aim in view.”

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“Sir, I take very strong objection to this Bill and the fundamental principles underlying it. My hon. Friend, Mr. Adityan, said that we must make bus travel cheap for the poor people. But our Hon. Minister does not want the poor people to travel in bus. He wants them to walk for reasons of health. I do not know whether our Hon. Ministers will take this advice and walk to improve their health and not use their cars. If they do, we will save the expenditure now incurred on the maintenance of their cars. There is no use in giving advices. They must follow them themselves. They are not able to walk short distances. That being so, how can poor people walk distances of 25 miles, 30 miles and so on where there are no railways. The Hon. Minister has no knowledge of our rural parts. This I say emphatically. Let him tour the rural parts in the backward areas in Rayalaseema or in Guntur or Krishna districts.

31st July 1952] [Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu]

There are many places which are not connected by rail, distances of 40 miles, 50 miles, even 100 or 150 miles. There is no use of asking people to walk such long distances. It is not for reasons of health that people go from one place to another, but on account of dire necessity they go to other places, and they have no other transport except the bus. That is why I say this is a tax on all except the rich who use cars. They alone are saved from this tax. This fact he must take into consideration."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is in the Select Committee; he can say all this in the Select Committee."

* SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Only one point, Sir, I wish to bring to the notice of the Hon. the Finance Minister. In our parts there are very few bus routes. There are possibilities for opening new ones. If private owners are not willing, Government might come forward to run buses on the new routes. This will bring in revenue for the Government. But it is not the policy of the Government to take up any development schemes. They want the people to use only the existing facilities. It is not a surprise to see this Government follow this policy. It was the Hon. Chief Minister who brought in sales tax which hit the poor hard. The tax proposed under this Bill will hit only the poorest of the poor. That is why we oppose the very principle of this Bill.

" Another point which I want to bring to the notice of the House is this. There is a provision in the Bill that the accounts and other things should be submitted to the police. Everyone knows how the police are functioning now. Now they are being given more powers so that they could harass the people."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member's time is up. The hon. Mr. Chidanandam will speak now."

* SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Finance Minister in introducing this Bill said he was a villager. I do not think so. He might have been born in a village and known people coming from villages, but I am sure he has not lived in a village. I am a villager. I travel from village to village in buses. After the war, people have taken to bus travel and even for short distances they are charged high rates. The operators are not kind to the passengers. They allow more passengers than the capacity of the bus and also collect double the charges. They do not keep accounts. They are evading payment of income-tax. Though the surcharge is only one pie per mile the increase in fare will be considerable on long distance journeys. This will touch the pocket of the poor man very much. This would mean that the poor should not travel by bus.

" Though there are number of bus routes now, they are not sufficient because, villagers, after the war, have taken to bus travel. Travel by carts entails long delay and inconvenience. They don't want to get hardened by walking the distance. After

[Sri V. Chidanandam] [31st July 1952]

walking long distances they* will be tired and will not be fit for doing any work at the end of the journey. So they are taking to bus travel. The number of routes and the number of buses running in those routes must be increased. If this surcharge is paid by the operators without increasing the fare, and if they keep regular accounts, I have no objection to the Bill being passed. But even now they are not keeping regular accounts and they are evading income-tax. There is a lot of over-loading. It will continue to be so whatever might be the charge, whether it is 8 pies or one anna per mile. The rates should not be increased. The operator must be asked to pay the tax and directed to keep regular accounts. Several operators after getting a good profit sell the right on these routes at black-market rates to others. I would therefore suggest that all bus routes should be auctioned. Rich people have cars. It is only the poor people that take to bus travel. Some middle class people also travel by bus. All these people cannot afford to bear the increase in the bus fare."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The hon. Member is repeating what he has already said."

* SRI V. CHIDANANDAM :—"I say, Sir, poor people also are human beings. So they must be given the facility to travel quickly and well, by bus. If the charges are increased, bus travel will not be made available to the poor people."

12-30
p.m.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is no necessity to make any lengthy speech inasmuch as the Bill is being referred to a Select Committee. The Hon. Finance Minister has been attempting to advance arguments to sugar-coat a bitter pill with ingenuity, that the incidence of taxation will not fall on the poor and middle class people. The entire line of his argument is that this tax is not going to involve further increase on the incidence of taxation on the poor. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister whether, if after careful enquiry, it is found that this tax falls mostly on the poor people, he is prepared to withdraw the Bill. The second part of his ingenious argument is that it is very unlikely that the poor passenger will be called upon to pay this surcharge because the operators are not charging even the maximum limit of 7 pies per mile at present and that, therefore, the surcharge is likely to be paid by the operators. From this admission itself it is already clear that the poor people cannot bear any further increase in taxation. My hon. Friend, Mr. Ramamurthi, has been at pains to try to analyse that the incidence of taxation of both State and Central Governments is already Rs. 25 per head. I would also like to point out that in the City of Madras where the income of the Corporation is about Rs. 2.0 crores for a population of about 15 lakhs, the average incidence of taxation is about Rs. 13 per head. Per family of six members the Central, State and local Government taxes work out to about Rs. 170 per annum which is equivalent to two to three months' wages of an average worker in the City of Madras. Therefore, I do not agree with the statement that the incidence of taxation is low. The

31st July 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

people of our State are already taxed to the maximum and they are not in a position to pay any further taxes. I do not know if the main object of the Bill is to see that the poor people give up this luxury of travel by bus and indulge in the past-time, the health-giving exercise of walking. If this is admitted it should be incorporated in the aims and objects of the Bill.

"The Hon. Finance Minister finally suggested that the taxation on the basis of surcharge at the rate of one pie per mile may be changed into one of a rate per seat per mile. If that suggestion is mooted, I would like to say that, unless the Government fixes the maximum rate the operator may charge the passenger for each mile; they will only be making the operators pass on the burden of taxation to the passenger, without at the same time the Government reaping the full benefit of the extra charge. I, therefore, feel that the present maximum rate of bus fare should not be enhanced under any circumstances. If the Government are really serious of getting further revenues, let them nationalize the bus transport in the State. The nationalization of bus transport in the City of Madras, in spite of the inefficient administration and in spite of the defects in the existing system of nationalization, has given us profits. Therefore, Sir, I would request the Hon. Minister to withdraw this Bill and bring forward proposals for nationalization of bus transport throughout the State, with a view to getting more revenue."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, on behalf of the United Democratic Front, I submit that we are opposed, as I already said once, to the increase of any tax or levy of new taxes at the present stage without a proper and comprehensive enquiry into the taxation structure and the incidence of taxation burden in our State. We believe that the revenue receipts under sales tax have been greatly under-estimated. We suggested that a conference of all the interests concerned, particularly in regard to sales tax, might be immediately convened so that the leakages in sales tax which are admitted on all sides might be properly gone into and a very efficient system of collection of sales tax at the present level could be introduced and thus improve the revenue position. We are of the opinion that, if the sales tax administration is improved, we can get nearly four to five crores of rupees even after giving margin for exemption of sales tax on essential food articles; our opinion is based upon the advice given by several persons who are connected not only with the payment of sales tax but also with the administration of sales tax. On that ground we are opposed to the increase of any tax or levy of new taxes.

"Sir, for one reason or other the purchasing power of the people has become very low and we, therefore, believe that this is not the proper time to levy new taxes. Besides any increase in taxation will have a direct effect upon the attitude of the Central Government towards the State, they might reduce the amount of grant or subvention or the block grant we require to push through our capital works. On this ground also, we are opposed to any

[Sri T. Viswanathan]

[31st July 1952]

increase in taxation or to the levy of new taxes. It has been our contention that the Government have not seriously considered the proposal of retrenchment. No attempt has been made in that direction so far as we know, after the present Government came into power. If we take this also into consideration, it will form another strong ground against fresh taxes.

"There are many reasons why all these Bills are opposed. You have been pleased to state, Sir, that the Bills are going to Select Committees and that some of us are members of the Select Committees; it is true we have agreed to serve on the Select Committees without in any way committing ourselves to the principle of taxation. We have agreed to do so because we want to oppose these proposals at every available stage. We shall not be afterwards told that having gone into the Select Committee, we have accepted the principle of taxation. We are making it clear to the House and to you, Sir, that at every stage, in the committee, we shall oppose the proposals, and if we succeed there will be no further trouble; if we don't succeed, still we shall oppose them from the preamble to the last clause in the House. Sir, I do not want to go into details as all the Members on this side who have spoken are unanimous on the point that this is not the time for new taxes from any point of view. Therefore, Sir, I once more make it clear that we have agreed to serve on the Select Committee only to oppose the Bill at every stage and we are not committed to the principle. Neither the Chairman of the Select Committee nor anybody else should tell us afterwards that having agreed to serve on the Select Committee we would not be allowed to raise this point of principle."

12-40
pm

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Finance Minister who moved for the consideration of the Bill has permitted me to reply on behalf of the Government to the various points raised during the debate.

"Sir, I am glad the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has made it very clear under what terms he is coming into the Select Committee. He has told us that he is doing so with no commitments whatsoever that he agrees to the principle of the Bill. I am glad he has made his position very clear even at the very outset. Sir, he raised some other points also as to why he and his party were opposing the Bill. He still feels that our revenues from sales tax have been under-estimated. He thinks that retrenchment is quite possible, and so he feels that these taxation measures are unnecessary. I say, Sir, on the floor of this House to-day, that if we, the Government find that his observations are true, we shall not proceed with the Bill any further. None of us are anxious to tax the poor at the present moment. I am as much interested in the poor as any one on the other side, Sir. But the fact remains that faced as we are with a deficit of three crores in the Budget, we are compelled to adjust our income and expenditure by resort to taxation. It is as unpalatable to us as it is to those in the Opposition, that we should come forward with these taxation proposals. One hon. Member from the other side went to the extent

31st July 1952] [Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

of saying that the poor man is already crippled with the existing taxes both of the State Government and the Centre and that any more additional burden would only worsen his already poor economic condition. Mr. Ramamurthi accused us of being very greedy. If greed can be a remedy for meeting some of our financial difficulties, I plead guilty to such a charge because the task of running this Government is entrusted to my Chief and his colleagues. However unpalatable this proposed tax may be to those who travel in the buses, we feel it is our duty to carry on the administration.

" Sir, let me inform the House that when we decided upon this measure of taxation, several issues now raised by some hon. Members were fully considered by us. We considered at first the question of auction of bus routes. My friend Mr. Thimma Reddi had waxed eloquent over this. We viewed this question from different angles. Under the existing conditions, we came to the conclusion that it would not be advisable to auction bus routes for we had to give a guarantee to the man to whom we auction, that he can operate on this route without any interference for at least two or three years. Otherwise it would not be possible for the man concerned to start the workshop and have the necessary spare parts. He ought to be given a monopoly for at least five years. So, that was the one main reason which weighed with us in deciding to drop the auctioning of bus routes.

" A second suggestion had been made that we should increase the tax on the existing passenger seats in the buses. It was of course pointed out that we did increase the tax from seventeen to thirty rupees. But then we allowed the bus-owners to increase the passenger fares also. Let me inform the House what the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee has said. After elaborate enquiry they came to the conclusion that thirty rupees was the ceiling rate and the tax on seats could not be increased any further.

" An hon. Member Mr. C. V. K. Rao, I believe had said that there are still more than 2,000 buses which have been registered but are not running. He was of the opinion that if we were to tax those buses also, we could get an enormous amount of money. I should submit, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very flimsy argument. Considering the number of such buses which have been registered and which have not been put on the road, after all the revenue that could be derived is very meagre indeed. Moreover under the Motor Vehicles Act, a bus-owner is entitled to ask for a refund if he had been taxed and his bus is not running. Therefore I submit, Mr. Speaker, Sir, that Mr. C. V. K. Rao's suggestion cannot be accepted.

" The other suggestion to drop the proposal to allow the rebate on petrol tax would result only in an income of about rupees fifty lakhs. This is not at all sufficient to bridge the large gap in our Budget.

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao] [31st July 1952]

" Previously there was a suggestion made that bus routes throughout the country could be distributed on a monopoly basis and the income derived therefrom by the Centre could be divided amongst the different Provinces. But ultimately that proved a failure.

" Friends like Mr. Thimma Reddi and Dr. K. B. Menon seem to be painting too rosy a picture about the huge profits earned by the bus-owners. Let me tell them that that might have been the case during war-time. But now the position is different. The bus-owners' position is none too encouraging at present. Let me not be mistaken as though I have come in defence of the capitalists. I am only stating the facts. Mr. Thimma Reddi is of the view that if we were to auction bus routes, then all our present deficit could be wiped out. Mr. Thimma Reddi thinks that it is very easy for a bus-owner to make profits in no time. I must say that my friend is sadly mistaken if he were to subscribe to that view. The picture is none too rosy as he imagines it to be. If I am not mistaken, if my friends do not mistake me for letting out a secret, I can say without fear of contradiction that some of my very friends who are assembled here to-day are involved in bus transactions at present. They would be fully aware of the present state of affairs of the bus-owners. It is very easy to make suggestions off-hand. Let us think well whether what we say is easy to be practised. Bus-owners are not financially quite well off at the present moment. Let us remember that.

" Mr. S. C. C. Anthony Pillai wanted at the outset an assurance from me that if I were able to get some huge amount from the bus-owners, then I should give a guarantee that I would not tax the passengers any more. Let me inform my hon. Friend that the Motor Vehicles Taxation Enquiry Committee did go into all details connected with the bus transport and arrived at the conclusion that we had reached a stage when we could no longer tax the bus-owners according to the seating capacity in their buses. When such is the case, how can I agree to the hon. Member's suggestion? Will it not create undue hardship both to the bus-company, bus-operator and the passengers also. Moreover what is the guarantee that we could be sure of the conduct of these bus-owners? Can we rest assured that they will not increase the fares at any time? An hon. Member had observed that it is not only the Government servants but ever so many persons who travel in the buses. The small merchant, the big businessman, the son-in-law going to the father-in-law's house—all these kind of people travel in our buses, even though the buses in our State are very rickety according to Dr. K. B. Menon. Anyway I do believe that faced as we are with a big deficit in our Budget, our passengers will not mind the slight increase which we have now proposed in bus fares. Let me inform the House that this proposed increase will in no way harass the public.

12-50 P.M. " My Friend Mr. C. V. K. Rao objected to the City Bus Service being exempted."

31st July 1952]

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" I did not object to the City Bus passengers not being taxed. If the principle of not taxing the City Bus passengers is good, then that principle must apply to mufassal places as well. That was what I said."

* THE HON. DR. U. KRISHNA RAO :—" I am going to explain why we do not propose to tax the City Bus passengers. It is not because the City Bus is owned by the Government that we do not want to tax. In Madras City, the same persons will be using the buses twice every day, once for going to their place of work and again for returning home. We thought it would not be fair to tax this class of people. What applies to the Madras City applies with equal force to other cities like Rajahmundry, Coimbatore, Madurai, etc. After all, the number of buses coming under the exemption will not be more than 600. It will be left to the Select Committee to consider whether this exemption is necessary or not. Nowhere is it said in the Bill that the City Bus shall be exempted. I leave it entirely to the Select Committee to make any alteration.

" My Friend suggested that we must increase the bus routes and the number of buses on each route. After we took up office, the Government enunciated their policy of liberalizing bus routes and permits. But I must say that it is not entirely in my hands. The matter is in the hands of the Road Transport Authorities and the Central Road Traffic Board. Only appeals or revision petitions come to me. If I take a wrong decision, the matter is taken before the most Honourable Judges of the Court. In my opinion, all the abuses heaped upon the Road Transport Authorities and the Central Road Traffic Board are not entirely warranted. After all they are judicial bodies. We have altered the constitution of the Central Road Traffic Board so as to provide for the inclusion of members with judicial experience who will view things in a dispassionate manner.

" My Friend charged me with the sins of omission and commission of my predecessors. Like the saying 'The King is dead, Long live the King', the Government continues and therefore we must take the responsibility, whether we like it or not, for the wrongs, if there were any, of our predecessors. The Government will give the most careful consideration to whatever suggestion is made by the Select Committee. I can only give this assurance that I shall do my best to remove whatever difficulty is pointed out in the field of motor transport.

" Unfortunately, in the order of Demands for Grants taken up, we could not reach the Demand relating to the Motor Vehicles Acts. Therefore I wish to take this opportunity for apologising to my Friend the Leader of the House for a wrong information which I gave. (An hon. Member : 'Leader of the Opposition.') I wish him luck in his attempt to become the Leader of the House, but we shall endeavour to prevent that. In answer to a question put by him, I gave the impression that the 20 lakhs of bus tickets

[Dr. U. Krishna Rao]

[31st July 1952]

got printed in England were exhausted. He said that the statement was not correct. I must apologise and say that the information given by the Leader of the Opposition was correct. There were enquiries later and I found that the tickets for which a trial order was placed were not exhausted. They are even now being issued on two routes. It is likely to take one more year to exhaust the 20 lakhs of tickets but I can say this much that no fresh order will be placed for printing those tickets in England. I thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity for correcting the impression that the Leader of Opposition was not telling the truth. I am afraid both of us were telling the truth, only from different angles.

“ My Friend Mr. S. C. C. Anthony Pillai said that this bitter pill had got a sugar coating. We have tried to coat the pill with as much sugar as possible. It is left to the Select Committee to retain the sugar coating or remove it and expose the pill. I hope the Select Committee will return the pill with the sugar, so that not only the Members of this House but also the public can swallow it with ease.

“ I can assure the House that all the points raised in this House will be considered by the Select Committee in a most sympathetic manner and we will try to bring out a Bill which will be acceptable to all.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The question is—

‘ That the Madras Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 4 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following Members :—

1. The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
2. „ Dr. U. Krishna Rao.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. „ A. M. Sambandam.
5. „ S. Panchaksharam.
6. „ D. Dasaratharamaiah Naidu.
7. „ N. Rajagopal.
8. „ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
9. „ H. M. Jagannatham.
10. „ A. Balarama Reddy.
11. „ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
12. Janab K. M. Seethi.
13. Dr. K. B. Menon.
14. Sri P. Thinnma Reddi.
15. „ M. Rajeswara Rao.
16. „ T. Viswanatham.
17. „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
18. „ K. P. Gopalan.

31st July 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

19. Sri M. Venugopala Gounder.*
20. „ P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
21. „ P. Ratnaswami Pillai.
22. „ S. T. Adityan.
23. „ S. Ramalingam.
24. „ D. Dasarathan.
25. „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.* "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Under rule 83 of the Assembly Rules, I appoint the Hon. Dr. U. Krishna Rao to be the Chairman of the Select Committee.”

(4) THE MADRAS IRRIGATION (LEVY OF BETTERMENT CONTRIBUTION)
BILL ^a, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

‘ That the Madras Irrigation (Levy of Betterment Contribution) Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 5 of 1952), be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members; and

‘ That under rule 81 of the Madras Assembly Rules, the leave of the House be granted to have 25 Members on the Select Committee—

1. The Hon. Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker.
2. „ C. Subramaniam.
3. Sri K. Rajaram.
4. „ P. Ranga Reddi.
5. „ K. V. Vema Reddi.
6. „ B. Krishnamurti Rao.
7. „ T. Ganapathi.
8. „ A. Appu.
9. „ P. Chellathurai.
10. „ K. Shanmugam.
11. „ T. Anantha Pai.
12. Janab K. K. Mohamed Shafee.
13. Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
14. „ G. Latchanna.
15. „ B. Balakrishnan.
16. „ T. Viswanatham.
17. „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.

^a Published in the Fort St. George Gazette, dated 30th June 1952.